

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-33 are currently pending in the application. New claims 34 and 35 are presented for consideration.

Claims 4-13, 17, 18, 22-26, 29, 31 and 32 each stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 4, 7, 17, 22, 26, 29 and 31 have been rewritten in independent form so as to be allowable. The remaining objected to claims each depend from one of these rewritten claims.

Claims 1-3, 14-16, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,318,545 (Ross II). Claims 21, 27, 28, 30 and 33 stand rejected under 35 USC §102 as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 1,580,638 (Benbow).

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 14-16, 19-21, 27, 28, 30 and 33 and favorable consideration of new claims 34 and 35 are requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to characterize the first roller as having a rotational axis. The at least one opening is characterized as elongate with a length extending substantially parallel to the rotational axis of the first roller.

Ross II does not teach or suggest a corresponding opening.

Claims 2, 3, 14-16, 19 and 20 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the cited art.

Claim 21 has been amended to characterize the first blade as comprising a single piece that bears against the first roller and the conveying belt to strip foreign matter from the first roller and conveying belt.

Benbow teaches a relatively complicated combination of elements to perform the two functions noted and does not teach or suggest the one piece construction claimed. Accordingly, claim 21 is believed allowable.

Claim 27 depends from claim 21 and recites further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the cited art.

Claim 28 is amended to characterize the first portion and second portion as defined by a single piece. As noted above, Benbow does not teach or suggest a single piece to perform this function.

Claims 30 and 33 each depend from claim 28 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the art.

New claim 34 depends from claim 1 and characterizes the one wall as having an axial extent relative to the rotational axis of the first roller, with the elongate opening extending over substantially the entire axial extent of the one wall. This even further distinguishes the claimed structure over Ross II.

New claim 35 corresponds to claim 1, as originally presented, and further characterizes the roller support system as comprising first and second independent blades that define the at least one wall.

The independent blades were originally cited in claim 16, which was rejected as anticipated by Ross II. However, the blades therein do not define any part of a corresponding wall.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-3, 14-16, 19-21, 27, 28, 30 and 33, favorable consideration of new claims 34 and 35, and allowance of the case are requested.

The additional claim fee of \$700.00 is enclosed. Should additional fees be required in connection with this matter, please charge our deposit account No. 23-0785.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800

Date: Feb 7, 2005